

REMARKS

The final Office Action mailed June 24, 2010 has been received and reviewed. All of claims 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28 and 30-27 stand rejected. Claims 10, 20, 22, and 27-28 have been amended and claim 21 has been canceled herein. Care has been exercised to introduce no new subject matter. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objections

Claim 27 was objected to as having insufficient antecedent basis for the terms “the display” in line 5 (now line 4) of the claim and “the boundaries” in line 6 (now line 5) of the claim. Applicants respectfully traverse said objection for the following reasons.

Claim 27 has been amended to replace “the” display with “a” display, and “the” has been removed from “the boundaries.” Claim 27 has also been amended to more clearly claim the features of “automatically extracting a character or word ... in response to determining ...” and “automatically extracting a property ... in response to determining ...” Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said objections to claim 27.

Claim 28 was objected to as ostensibly being unclear in the claim limitation of “interpreting the input” and the previously added “determining” step. Applicants respectfully traverse said objection for the following reasons.

Claim 28 has been amended to remove said “interpreting” limitation and to more clearly claim Applicants’ “determining” step. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said objections to claim 28.

Claim 36 was objected to because the limitation “any subsequent sets of textual characters reside outside the path drawn by the user” was ostensibly unclear. The Office based

this objection upon the premise that any textual characters not in the selected region when the region is selected are inherently outside the path drawn (*see OA*, p.3). Applicants respectfully traverse said objection for the following reason.

Claim 36 requires that any *subsequent* sets of textual characters reside outside the path drawn by the user. Therefore, any drawn path that does not completely encompass the entire display area could possibly render subsequent sets of textual characters residing outside the drawn path. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said objection to claim 36.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

A) Applicable Authority

Title 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) declares, a patent shall not issue when “the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.” The Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere* counseled that an obviousness determination is made by identifying: the scope and content of the prior art; the level of ordinary skill in the prior art; the differences between the claimed invention and prior art references; and secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966). To support a finding of obviousness, the initial burden is on the Office to apply the framework outlined in *Graham* and to provide some reason, or suggestions or motivations found either in the prior art references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the prior art reference or to combine prior art reference teachings to produce the claimed invention. See *Application of Bergel*, 292 F.2d 955, 956-957 (CCPA 1961).

B) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter “Woolf”), and U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182630 (hereinafter “Saund”)

Claims 10, 20-22, 30, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, and further in view of Woolf and Saund. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to require, in part, “obtaining additional context information by extracting the first set of one or more textual characters and extracting a second set of textual characters displayed in proximity with the first set.” Said amendment was previously claimed as part of claim 21. Claim 21 was allegedly described by Dawe (col.7 lines 6-20 lines 61-65) and Denoue (paragraph 72). However, there is no description of two separate sets, which would be necessary for the first set to be displayed in the proximity of the second set. Neither Woolf nor Saund compensate for the deficiencies of Dawe and Denoue in describing or suggesting amended independent claim 10. Thus, amended independent claim 10, as well as dependent claims 20, 22, 30, and 36-37 are allowable over the prior art of record. Claim 21 has been canceled, thereby rendering its rejection moot.

Amended dependent claim 22 is also allowable on its own merit for the following reasons. The Office alleged that the description in Dawe of the words “job” or “awareness” may be considered the second set of textual characters (*see OA*, p.9). However, amended dependent claim 22 further requires obtaining a first pointer between the context information and the textual region, and obtaining a second pointer between the additional context information and the textual region. Support for said amendment can be found in Applicants’ original specification at ¶ [59].

The prior art of record, either alone or in any combination, fails to describe or suggest amended dependent claim 22. Thus, amended dependent claim 22 is allowable on its own merit.

Dependent claim 36 is also allowable on its own merit for the following reasons. The Office alleged that it is inherent that any subsequent characters which are not in the initially drawn path will be outside the drawn path (*see OA*, p.10). Applicants disagree, using the following example, which is used for exemplary purposes only. A path could be drawn which encompasses the left half portion of the display. If subsequent textual characters are added horizontally across the display (as in the case of English written text), then the subsequent textual characters would reside both inside and outside the drawn path. Thus, dependent claim 36 is allowable on its own merit.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claims 10, 20, 22, 30, 36 and 37.

C) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter “Woolf”), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182630 (hereinafter “Saund”), and U.S. Pat. No. 6,334,157 (hereinafter “Oppermann”)

Claims 11, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund, and further in view of Oppermann. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 11, 25, and 26 depend from amended independent claim 10. As discussed above, amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund. Oppermann does not compensate for the deficiencies of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund in describing or suggesting amended independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims

11, 25, and 26 are allowable over the prior art of record, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claims 11, 25, and 26.

D) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter “Woolf”), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182630 (hereinafter “Saund”), and U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0135815 (hereinafter “Browne”)

Claims 15, 18, 32 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, and Saund, and further in view of Browne. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 15, 18, 32, and 33 depend from amended independent claim 10. As discussed above, amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund. Browne does not compensate for the deficiencies of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund in describing or suggesting amended independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims 15, 18, 32, and 33 are allowable over the prior art of record, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claims 15, 18, 32, and 33.

E) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter “Woolf”), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182630 (hereinafter “Saund”), and U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0076109 (hereinafter “Hertzfeld”)

Claims 32 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, and Saund, and further in view of Hertzfeld. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 32 and 35 depend from amended independent claim 10. As discussed above, amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund. Hertzfeld does not compensate for the deficiencies of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund in describing or suggesting amended independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claims 32 and 35 are allowable over the prior art of record, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claims 32 and 35.

F) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter “Woolf”), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182630 (hereinafter “Saund”), and U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0100849 (hereinafter “Chan”)

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund, and further in view of Chan. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 34 depends from amended independent claim 10. As discussed above, amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund. Chan does not compensate for the deficiencies of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund in describing or suggesting amended independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claim 34 is allowable over the prior art of record, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claim 34.

G) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter “Woolf”), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182630 (hereinafter “Saund”), U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0135815 (hereinafter “Browne”), and U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0101156 (hereinafter “Newman”)

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund, and Browne, and further in view of Newman. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 17 depends from amended independent claim 10. As discussed above, amended independent claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund. Browne and Newman, either alone or in combination, do not compensate for the deficiencies of Denoue, Dawe, Woolf, and Saund in describing or suggesting amended independent claim 10. Therefore, dependent claim 17 is allowable over the prior art of record, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claim 17.

H) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter “Denoue”), U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter “Dawe”), U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0076109 (hereinafter “Hertzfeld”), and U.S. Pub. No. 2006/0100849 (hereinafter “Chan”)

Claims 24 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue in view of Dawe, Hertzfeld, and Chan. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claim 27 has been amended to require, in part, “pointing a first pointer from the context information to the displayed content ... pointing a second pointer from the additional context information to the displayed content.” Support for said amendment can be

found in Applicants' original specification at ¶ [59]. The prior art of Denoue, Dawe, Hertzfeld, and Chan, either alone or in any combination, do not describe or suggest amended independent claim 27. Since amended independent claim 27, as well as dependent claim 24 are allowable over the prior art of record, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claims 24 and 27.

I) Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Pat. No. 7,042,594 (hereinafter "Dawe"), U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119762 (hereinafter "Denoue"), WO 2001/42980 (hereinafter "Woolf"), and U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0076109 (hereinafter "Hertzfeld")

Claims 28 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawe in view of Denoue, Woolf, and Hertzfeld. Applicants respectfully traverse said rejection for the following reasons.

Independent claim 28 has been amended to require, in part, "pointing a first pointer from the selected content to the context information ... pointing a second pointer from the selected content to the additional context information." Support for said amendment can be found in Applicants' original specification at ¶ [59]. The prior art of Dawe, Denoue, Woolf, and Hertzfeld, either alone or in any combination, do not describe or suggest amended independent claim 28. Since amended independent claim 28, as well as dependent claim 31 are allowable over the prior art of record, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of said rejection and allowance of claims 28 and 31.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 10-11, 15, 17-18, 20, 22, 24-28, and 30-37 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 202/783-8400 or nberezny@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same.

The required fee of \$810 for this Request for Continued Examination is being submitted electronically herewith. It is believed that no additional fee is due. However, if that belief is in error, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 with reference to Attorney Docket Number 306171.01/MFCP.153380.

Respectfully submitted,

/NEMA BEREZNY/

NEMA BEREZNY
Reg. No. 57,706

TLB/NOB/tq
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550